

The thermal Casimir effect for conducting plates and the Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem.

Giuseppe Bimonte

*Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche Università di Napoli Federico II Complesso Universitario MSA,
Via Cintia I-80126 Napoli Italy and INFN Sezione di Napoli, ITALY*

We examine recent prescriptions for estimating the thermal Casimir force between two metallic plates from the point of view of their consistency with the Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem of classical statistical physics. We find that prescriptions including the effect of ohmic dissipation satisfy the theorem, while prescriptions that neglect ohmic dissipation do not.

PACS numbers:

Keywords: Casimir, thermal, statistical

I. INTRODUCTION

Much attention has been devoted recently to the study of the influence of temperature on the Casimir force [1]. In this contribution, we shall focuss our attention on the thermal Casimir force for two metallic, non-magnetic plates, a problem that involves subtle theoretical difficulties not yet understood as we write. We recall that the thermal Casimir pressure $P(a, T)$ between two plane-parallel dielectric plates in vacuum at distance a is provided by the following formula due to Lifshitz:

$$P(a, T) = -\frac{k_B T}{2\pi^2} \sum_{l \geq 0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{l,0}\right) \int d^2 \mathbf{k}_\perp q_l \sum_{\alpha=\text{TE, TM}} \left(\frac{e^{2aq_l}}{r_\alpha^2(i\xi_l, k_\perp)} - 1 \right)^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{k}_\perp$ is the on-plane wave-vector, $\xi_l = 2\pi k_B T l / \hbar$ are the Matsubara frequencies, $q_l = \sqrt{k_\perp^2 + \xi_l^2 / c^2}$, and $r_\alpha(i\xi_l, k_\perp)$ are the reflection coefficient of the slabs, evaluated at imaginary frequencies $\omega_l = i\xi_l$. In the case of conducting plates, the object of controversy is the correct magnitude of the terms with $l = 0$, whose evaluation requires making a prescription for the reflection coefficients $r_\alpha(0, k_\perp)$ of the slabs at zero-frequency (the terms with $l > 0$ pose no problems, and can be evaluated very accurately using optical data of the material constituting the plates). We shall only consider in what follows normal (i.e. non superconducting) non-magnetic good conductors, like gold (poor conductors have also recently attracted much attention [2], but we shall not consider them here). For good conductors $r_{\text{TM}}(0, k_\perp)$ is obviously equal to one, but the correct magnitude of $r_{\text{TE}}(0, k_\perp)$ is controversial. The alternative prescriptions that have been proposed for $r_{\text{TE}}(0, k_\perp)$ can be dubbed as the Drude and the plasma prescription, respectively. On one hand, the Drude prescription maintains that

$$r_{\text{TE}}(0, k_\perp)|_{\text{Dr}} = 0, \quad (2)$$

which represents the limiting value for zero-frequency of the TE Fresnel reflection coefficient, once the Drude model of a ohmic conductor is adopted. On the contrary, the plasma prescription neglects altogether ohmic dissipation and takes for $r_{\text{TE}}(0, k_\perp)$ the following non-vanishing value:

$$r_{\text{TE}}(0, \mathbf{k}_\perp)|_{\text{pl}} = \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_P^2 / c^2 + k_\perp^2} - k_\perp}{\sqrt{\Omega_P^2 / c^2 + k_\perp^2} + k_\perp}, \quad (3)$$

where Ω_P is the plasma frequency of the conductor, as obtained from optical data at IR frequencies. There is no room here to discuss in detail the reasons in favor or against either prescription, and we address the reader to Ref.[1].

In order to discriminate between the Drude and the plasma prescriptions, we recently proposed [3] to test their consistency with a well known result from classical statistical physics, i.e. the Bohr- van Leeuwen theorem [4]. To justify this approach, we note on one hand that the Casimir effect is an equilibrium phenomenon, and therefore the theoretical models used for the plates should be consistent with the dictates of statistical physics. It is interesting to note, in this regard, that statistical physics does indeed imply very general constraints, known as Onsager's reciprocity relations, on the possible form of the 2×2 reflection matrix of a homogeneous possibly anisotropic surface, that for example rule out certain phenomenological models of chiral materials [5]. On the other hand, to justify recourse to a theorem of classical statistical physics, we observe that, differently from the $l > 0$ terms, the troublesome $l = 0$ terms of Lifshitz formula have essentially a classical character, since they do not explicitly involve Planck's constant. Obviously this remark applies only to normal metals, and indeed the Bohr- van Leeuwen theorem was originally derived to explain their weak magnetic properties. Obviously, this is not the case for magnetic or superconducting materials, whose response functions depend on quantum effects that disappear in the classical limit.

II. THE BOHR-VAN LEEUWEN THEOREM

The Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem originated early in the 20th century, in an attempt to explain the absence of strong diamagnetism in normal conductors placed in an external magnetic field [4]. By slightly generalizing its initial content, that referred to a material placed in a static external magnetic field, we can state the theorem as saying that in classical systems at thermal equilibrium *matter decouples from transverse em fields*. To prove it, consider the *classical microscopic* Hamiltonian for a system of N charged particles interacting with the em field, in the Coulomb gauge ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$):

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2m_i} \left[\mathbf{P}_i - \frac{e_i}{c} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}_i) + \mathbf{A}_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}_i)) \right]^2 + \sum_{i<j} e_i e_j v(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) + \sum_{i=1}^N V^{(\text{walls})}(\mathbf{r}_i) + H_0^{(\text{rad})}, \quad (4)$$

where $v(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|)$ is the Coulomb electrostatic potential, $V^{(\text{walls})}(\mathbf{r})$ is a confining potential mimicking the walls of the particles' containers, $H_0^{(\text{rad})}$ is the free Hamiltonian for the fluctuating em field $\mathbf{A}$ and we possibly allow for the presence of an external static magnetic field with potential $\mathbf{A}_{\text{ext}}$. Consider now the classical partition function of the system $Z = \int d\mu_{\text{part}} \int d\mu_{\text{rad}} \exp(-\beta H)$, where $d\mu_{\text{part}}$ and $d\mu_{\text{rad}}$ are the phase-space canonical measures for the particles and the em field, respectively. It is then straightforward to check that under the canonical transformation:

$$\mathbf{P}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{P}'_i = \mathbf{P}_i - \frac{e_i}{c} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}_i) + \mathbf{A}_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}_i)) \quad (5)$$

Z factorizes into the product

$$Z = Z^{(\text{part})} \times Z_0^{(\text{rad})}, \quad (6)$$

where $Z_0^{(\text{rad})} = \int d\mu_{\text{rad}} \exp(-\beta H_0^{(\text{rad})})$ is the partition function for the free em field in empty space, and $Z^{(\text{part})} = \int d\mu_{\text{part}} \exp(-\beta H^{(\text{part})})$, where $H^{(\text{part})} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{P}_i^2 / (2m_i) + \sum_{i<j} e_i e_j v(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|)$. The factorization property Eq. (6) shows that at *thermal equilibrium* the particles and the transverse em field are completely decoupled. This decoupling property has two important physical consequences: on one hand, it implies that an external magnetic field $\mathbf{A}_{\text{ext}}$ does not affect the thermodynamic properties of matter, and on the other hand it implies that the presence of matter has no influence on thermal averages of the fluctuating em field. The former implication provides the original content of the Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem [4], while the second implication is the one we need for the purposes of Casimir physics, as we discuss below.

III. THE BOHR-VAN LEEUWEN THEOREM AND THE CASIMIR EFFECT

In the previous Section, we have shown that in classical statistical physics, the thermal averages of the transverse em field are independent of matter. As we now explain, this result has important consequences for the thermal Casimir effect. We consider the simple case of two identical plane-parallel homogeneous and isotropic slabs with complex permittivity $\epsilon(\omega)$, lying in the (x, y) plane, separated by an empty gap of width a . As it is well known, the Casimir pressure $P(a, T)$ between the slabs is equal to the (renormalized) quantum thermal average $\langle T_{zz} \rangle$ of the component T_{zz} of the Maxwell stress tensor, evaluated at any point in the empty gap. It is possible to split $\langle T_{zz} \rangle$ as

$$\langle T_{zz} \rangle = \langle T_{\parallel zz} \rangle + \langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $\langle T_{\parallel zz} \rangle$ and $\langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle$ represent the contributions from the longitudinal and the transverse em field, respectively. It is shown in Ref. [3] that $\langle T_{\parallel zz} \rangle$ and $\langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle$ have the expressions:

$$\langle T_{\parallel zz} \rangle = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega}{\omega} E_\beta(\omega) \int dk_\perp k_\perp^2 \text{Im} \left[\left(1 - \frac{e^{2k_\perp a}}{\bar{r}^2(\omega)} \right)^{-1} \right], \quad (8)$$

$$\langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle = -\frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega}{\omega} E_\beta(\omega) \text{Im} [T_\perp(\omega)] \quad (9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{T}_\perp(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dk_\perp k_\perp \left\{ q \sum_{\alpha=\text{TE, TM}} \left(\frac{e^{2qd}}{r_\alpha^2(\omega, k_\perp)} - 1 \right)^{-1} - k_\perp \left(\frac{e^{2k_\perp d}}{\bar{r}^2(\omega)} - 1 \right)^{-1} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Here $q = \sqrt{k_\perp^2 - \omega^2/c^2}$, $\bar{r} = (\epsilon(\omega) - 1)/(\epsilon(\omega) + 1)$ and $E_\beta(\omega) = \hbar\omega/2 \coth[\hbar\omega/(2k_B T)]$. Consider now the transverse contribution $\langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle$: since, as shown in the previous Section, the classical statistical averages of the transverse em field are independent of matter, it follows that $\langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle$ must vanish in the classical limit. For $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, the quantity $E_\beta(\omega)$ approaches the limit $k_B T$, and then it can be taken outside the integral on the r.h.s. of Eq. (9). After further rotating the ω domain of integration from the real positive axis to the imaginary positive axis (such a rotation is permitted by the analyticity properties of the complex permittivity $\epsilon(\omega)$ of causal media), it is easy to verify [3] that

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle = -k_B T \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{T}_\perp(\omega). \quad (11)$$

It can be easily verified that for vanishing frequency the TM contribution to $\mathcal{T}_\perp(\omega)$ always cancels against the second term between the curly brackets on the r.h.s. of Eq. (10), and then one finds:

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \langle T_{\perp zz} \rangle = -\frac{k_B T}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dk_\perp k_\perp^2 \left(\frac{e^{2k_\perp d}}{r_{\text{TE}}^2(0, k_\perp)} - 1 \right)^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

The Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem requires that the quantity on the r.h.s. vanishes for all separations, and this is only possible if

$$r_{\text{TE}}(0, k_\perp) = 0. \quad (13)$$

The conclusion is that the Drude prescription Eq. (2) is consistent with the theorem, while the plasma prescription Eq. (3) is not.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem of classical statistical physics states that in the classical limit the transverse em field decouples from matter. We have used this theorem as a criterion to discriminate between the so-called Drude and plasma prescriptions that have been recently proposed to evaluate the thermal Casimir force between two metallic non-magnetic plates. We have shown that the Drude prescription is consistent with this theorem, while the plasma prescription is not. The results derived in this paper do not apply to magnetic or superconducting materials, because the properties of such materials arise from quantum effects that disappear in the classical limit.

-
- [1] G.L. Klimchitskaya, U. Mohideen and V.M. Mostepanenko, arXiv:0902.4022.
 - [2] L.P. Pitaevskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 163202 (2008).
 - [3] G. Bimonte, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 042107 (2009).
 - [4] H. J., van Leeuwen, J. Phys. Radium **2**, 362 (1921); J. H. Van Vleck, *The Theory of Electric and Magnetic Susceptibilities* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1932).
 - [5] G. Bimonte and E. Santamato, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 013810 (2007).